MAR 1 2 1986

Fort Monmouth Installation Assessment

Karen Sudy, Environmental Engineer
Eastern NY/Caribbean Remedial Action Section

Helen Shannon, Environmental Protection Specialist NJ Site Investigation and Compliance Branch

- 1. In notes dated 1/26/81 per Hugh McNamin it is mentioned that there are 6 test wells in operation on the landfill behind bldg. 697. Are there any data available from these test wells? Recommendation: a sampling program using these wells and sampling for priority pollutants should be developed.
- 2. The abstract states that the sanitary landfills and the sludge drying beds were identified as potential sites of contamination. These sites should be looked at in more detail for the next phase, i.e. it was indicated that the present landfill contains unwashed pesticide/herbicide cans, STP sludge, drugs and outdated photograpic chemicals. Samples from the sludge drying beds and groundwater samples and/or soil samples should be taken and analysed for priority pollutants.
- 3. It is stated that the geology of Fort Monmouth, CWA, and FA is conducive to migration via surface and subsurface routes. There are no data available on subsurface migration in the vicinity of the 3 installations. A ground water monitoring program would help to determine if the contaminants are migrating and in what direction they are migrating.
- 4. The surface water quality was determined to be poor. The parameters that were tested for (i.e. PH, conductivity, temperature etc.) are not indicative of the types of contaminants disposed of. Surface water samples should be analysed for priority pollutants.
- 5. In the conclusion, it is stated that Fort Monmouth will forward the findings of the RCRA study on landfills. What is this RCRA study that is mentioned and what does it entail?
- 6. Memo dated Jan 15, 1986 What does it mean that sludge drying beds were "sanitized and disinfected"?

2ERRD/NYCRAB/KS/mr:3/7/86 on Karen Sudy's Disc

CONCURRENCES						
NYCRAS	3					
SURNAME SUDY	45	\				389435
ATE 3/1/8	72					

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY **REGION II**

DATE:

MAD 1 2 1986

SUBJECT: Fort Monmouth Installation Assessment

FROM: Karen Sudy, Environmental Engineer

Eastern NY/Caribbean Remedial Action Section

TO: Helen Shannon, Environmental Protection Specialist NJ Site Investigation and Compliance Branch

- In notes dated 1/26/81 per Hugh McNamin it is mentioned that there are 6 test wells in operation on the landfill behind bldg. 697. Are there any data available from these test wells? Recommendation: a sampling program using these wells and sampling for priority pollutants should be developed.
- The abstract states that the sanitary landfills and the sludge drying beds were identified as potential sites of contamination. These sites should be looked at in more detail for the next phase, i.e. it was indicated that the present landfill contains unwashed pesticide/herbicide cans, STP sludge, drugs and outdated photograpic. chemicals. Samples from the sludge drying beds and groundwater samples and/or soil samples should be taken and analysed for priority pollutants.
- It is stated that the geology of Fort Monmouth, CWA, and EA is conducive to migration via surface and subsurface routes. There are no data available on subsurface migration in the vicinity of the 3 installations. A ground water monitoring program would help to determine if the contaminants are migrating and in what direction they are migrating.
- The surface water quality was determined to be poor. parameters that were tested for (i.e. PH, conductivity, temperature etc.) are not indicative of the types of contaminants disposed of. Surface water samples should be analysed for priority pollutants.
- In the conclusion, it is stated that Fort Monmouth will forward the findings of the RCRA study on landfills. What is this RCRA study that is mentioned and what does it entail?
- Memo dated Jan 15, 1986 What does it mean that sludge drying beds were "sanitized and disinfected"?